



Inspecting policing  
in the public interest

# Assessing Police Performance: Giving the Public a Voice

PROPOSALS FOR CONSULTATION  
ON ROUNDED ASSESSMENT

May 2009

**Deadline for responses: Friday 26 June 2009**

# **Rounded Assessment as a Police Performance Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism**

---

## **CONTENTS**

- 1. Overview**
- 2. Background and policy context**
- 3. Elements of Rounded Assessment**
- 4. Methodology – scoring, quality assurance and reporting**
- 5. Next steps: responding to the consultation questions**

**Appendix A – Consultees**

**Appendix B – APACS performance indicators**

**Appendix C – Domain details**

**Appendix D – Screen Prints of new HMIC web site**

## **Rounded Assessment as a Police Performance Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism**

---

### **1. OVERVIEW**

1. This consultation paper<sup>1</sup> sets out Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's (HMIC's) proposed framework for monitoring and assessing the performance of police forces in England and Wales, in line with its new responsibilities as described in the Policing Green Paper (July 2008) and the *New Performance Landscape for Crime and Policing* paper recently published by the Home Office. In particular, HMIC seeks to assess police performance *in the public interest*, and report local and national outcomes of *interest to the public*.

2. The Green Paper outlined a new approach to police performance. While the management of performance rests squarely with chief officers, a number of other agencies have important roles; the Green Paper clarifies what had, over recent years, become a rather confusing network of relationships. The Home Office declared an intention to step back from target-setting and monitoring, focusing on strategic national direction and holding forces and police authorities to account for only one target – increasing public confidence. HMIC has been assigned a lead role in monitoring performance overall, identifying and challenging under-performance, in the public interest. Police authorities must shape effective direction for individual forces and hold chief constables to account for delivery of local priorities and targets. Finally, the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) will provide support for performance improvement by both forces and police authorities.

3. HMIC has been involved in performance monitoring from the early days of the Policing Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) and its successor, the Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS). These systems were based primarily on numerical measures and therefore lent themselves to comparison between forces. However, some critically important aspects of police work are less amenable to measurement, and a number of expert commentators (inside and outside the service) believe that any diagnostic will be stronger if it is matched by a qualitative assessment, that both reflects differing local circumstances and covers activities such as tackling organised criminality. Insufficient weight may well have been given to these areas in the past because they were less amenable to quantification.

---

• <sup>1</sup> For details of principal consultees see Appendix A

## Rounded Assessment Consultation

4. In developing a new approach, HMIC will build upon the strengths of PPAF and APACS as diagnostic tools. For example, all of the police-specific indicators in APACS will be retained (see Appendix B), and we believe that a five-domain<sup>2</sup> structure (with some revision to names and content) offers a broad view of policing. The principal departure from PPAF/APACS is that, where quantitative measures cannot yet reflect effectiveness, we will assign appropriate weight to qualitative assessment and professional judgement. We will also acknowledge that some crime areas - especially those involving violence - have special significance for the public. It is vital that police performance is explained to the public, so that forces can be held to account for the task of keeping communities safe from harm. Statistics will be used sparingly, as research shows that the public is neither interested in, nor trusting of, statistics. We will focus on where the public is put at risk through poor performance, using easily understood graphics to convey key messages and explain relative performance to the public. The introduction of context – notably the policing environment and the level of resources available to the force – provides a more rounded assessment.

5. The rounded assessment (RA) domains are:

- Confidence and Satisfaction
- Local Crime and Policing
- Protection from Serious Harm
- Value for Money and Productivity
- Managing the Organisation

These are explained fully in Section 3. The first two domains are rich in relevant data and the assessment will be predominantly a desk-top review. The remaining three domains also contain quantitative measures but require varying degrees of qualitative work to generate judgements. Some of this work will be derived from analysis of inspection and other evidence bases, but some fieldwork-based assessment will be needed to update areas such as major crime investigation and protecting vulnerable people. However, HMIC's resources to conduct such fieldwork are constrained and prioritisation is necessary. RA is thus a longer term development; the first iteration (Autumn 2009) will be based primarily upon statistical analysis and the existing evidence base of inspection findings (including those from other inspectorates), supplemented by a limited amount of fieldwork. Over time, the evidence base of qualitative assessment will become more extensive.

---

<sup>2</sup> A domain is a grouping of similar/related activities for assessment purposes.

## Rounded Assessment Consultation

6. During the establishment of RA we must maintain a watchful eye on how individual forces are doing and step in whenever performance deteriorates. Consequently, a more immediate task is the re-invigoration of the Police Performance Steering Group (PPSG) process. This HMIC-led approach will use established techniques to identify performance 'outliers' and will conduct appropriate analyses and investigations to ensure that qualitative issues are properly factored into the consideration. If performance problems are not resolved promptly and sustainably by individual forces then statutory intervention powers will be invoked.

7. RA seeks to address the needs of the police service and its monitors for comparative performance assessment, but more importantly it will strive to report, in an accessible way, matters that are in the public interest and of interest to the public. This consultation process (which includes focus groups with members of the public), and subsequent stakeholder engagement, seeks to identify:

- **How best RA can capture an accurate, timely and informed picture of force performance;**
- **How the outputs of RA – especially risk, confidence and VFM - can be presented to inform the public, to help people both understand and challenge police performance; and**
- **How RA can be used to improve police performance.**

8. The consultation seeks to open a genuine debate about the best systems, processes and methodologies to underpin the new framework and, of course, if stakeholders have other proposals or wider comments about the best way of describing performance, they are encouraged to submit these. HMIC is committed to being an open and engaged regulator. We accept that no organisation has a monopoly on good ideas, and encourage stakeholders to help us develop and implement a better system that is, above all, focused on the policing outcomes delivered to the public. Consultation is an ongoing process which will continue throughout the life of the RA process, we are therefore open to receive formal and informal feedback at anytime in the future.

9. In producing this consultation document we have, as far as practicable and where relevant, complied with the Cabinet Office guidance. Respondents are invited to submit responses to the questions set out in this narrative (and summarised in Section 5) using the attached template. For further information on this development please contact the consultation coordinator, David Harris, ([david.harris@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:david.harris@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)) in the first instance.

## **Rounded Assessment as a Police Performance Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism**

---

### **2. BACKGROUND AND POLICY CONTEXT**

10. The Policing Green Paper, *From the Neighbourhood to the National: Policing our Communities Together*, was published in July 2008, and the Government's subsequent response to the Green Paper consultation was released in November 2008. These documents set out how the relationship between the police service and the public will be transformed, supported by a similarly transformed relationship between central Government and the police service.

11. HMIC is very clear about the particular responsibilities it has assumed under this new arrangement. Improvements in volume crime reduction and detection increases over the last five or more years have been hard won and should not be relinquished. Equally, the understanding of the multi-agency nature of community safety work is well understood, and we now have better systems to assure joint accountability. The new performance landscape must reflect an increasingly complex set of challenges that exemplify the 'local to global' stretch, from neighbourhood policing to tackling the international terrorist threat. Value for money has to be more central to the assessment, which means playing in a more sophisticated type of productivity analysis based on benchmarked, comparative profiles.

12. So HMIC is pursuing a genuinely 'rounded assessment'. It draws upon the balanced scorecard approach, in that it seeks to contextualise the very different policing environments and critical resource availability issues. But it resolutely does not offer hiding places for deteriorating or poor performance. The starting point for analysis will be the force's performance against itself, with a desire to achieve improvement within a framework of prioritisation and productivity.

13. We envisage that RA will be a public-facing, web-based delivery of performance assessments. Lying behind this is the ongoing monitoring regime that will deliver HMIC's commitment to focus its attention on performance that may have a bearing on public confidence. For example, how prompt and effective are forces' responses to the public's calls for service? Is the level of anti-social behaviour or the risk of being burgled reducing? HMIC's approach is to capture the lessons of successful performance monitoring processes as they have evolved over the last 15 years, adding value through intelligent contextualisation, qualitative assessment and linkages to Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAA)<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Comprehensive Area Assessments are place-based judgements about the quality of local services in that particular area – schools, hospitals, policing and community safety, housing etc; they are based predominantly on statistics and some interpretation by the main public service inspectorates, notably the Audit Commission and including Ofsted and HMIC.

## Rounded Assessment Consultation

It will give greater emphasis to the spread of activities from local through to BCU level through to regional level and, in particular, to commitments on general responsiveness as exemplified in the Policing Pledge.

14. In addition to monitoring national performance from the centre, HMIC will work 'upstream' with forces to ensure that they have the most effective performance management capability. Deteriorating performance – even on the part of relatively good performers – needs to be 'nipped in the bud'. HMIC's 2007 national inspection in this area provided ample evidence that effective performance management not only enhances performance results but reduces organisational and public risk. If HMIC succeeds in this 'upstream' work (in conjunction with NPJA), fewer forces will fall within the scope of central monitoring or intervention because they will have identified and resolved performance issues themselves at an early stage.

15. The new performance landscape signals a different role for HMIC, drawing on its past achievements and developing expertise for the future. Key responsibilities include:

- ✚ Developing HMIC as an organisation that will act as 'a fierce advocate and guarantor' of the public interest, with a greater emphasis on public-facing inspection and reporting;
- ✚ Conducting inspections of policing activity based on a careful analysis of where the risk of public harm is most acute;
- ✚ Conducting inspections (jointly with the Audit Commission) of police authorities, to promote local accountability;
- ✚ Putting in place ongoing monitoring arrangements such that any marked dips in a force's performance are brought to the attention of both the police authority and the force command team; and
- ✚ Ensuring that, where a force or authority does not respond promptly and effectively to performance problems then action will follow to ensure resolution – through the issue of public interest letters and, ultimately, through a recommendation to the Home Secretary that statutory powers of direction are invoked.

16. RA underpins many of these responsibilities. Analysts will maintain a watching brief on the broad performance of forces, using the five domain headings, and bring to the attention of police authorities and chief officers performance deteriorations/concerns in relation to risk, public confidence and VFM that are clearly not simply 'blips'. Discreet investigation, using the intelligence network of HMIC's regionally based staff officers, will identify whether a genuine performance problem exists, and this will then be referred to PPSG. The RA work, especially on local issues, will inform and be informed by the CAA. The effectiveness of remedial action will signal how robust the police authority is in challenging the force to improve performance. RA may provide intelligence on areas of vulnerability that could lead HMIC to conduct national thematic inspections, and will facilitate fieldwork visits during such inspections.

## **Rounded Assessment as a Police Performance Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism**

---

### **3. ELEMENTS OF ROUNDED ASSESSMENT**

17. RA is the new assessment framework by which HMIC will draw conclusions about the performance of individual police forces, and underpins the annual 'state of the service' report by HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary. Assessment will initially be at force level but will extend to more local reporting as soon as practicable. RA will replace APACS<sup>4</sup> and its predecessor, PPAF; the main differences are highlighted below:

- the assessment will focus on police performance; wider crime reduction partnership activity falls within other regimes such as CAA and Home Office monitoring of public service agreements (PSAs);
- RA takes fuller account of HMIC's focus on value for money;
- the assessment is not designed as a practitioner dialogue – it will be more public-facing, while still meeting the needs of professional audiences;
- RA includes contextual information, including the specific policing environment and available resources; and
- qualitative assessment and professional judgement will be more prominent in conclusions where statistics cannot provide a sufficiently full picture.

18. The assessment will make the best use of performance data, diagnostic information, locally collected data such as survey results, a wealth of inspection evidence and professional judgements in reaching conclusions as to whether services are effective, equitable and provide value for money. Although the emphasis will be on results/outcomes, analysis will also strive to gauge the relationship between inputs, processes and outputs. For example, benchmarking may reveal some link between the degree of analytical capacity and some performance outcomes.

19. RA is based on a 'balanced scorecard' approach, encompassing five key areas of activity or 'domains'. As far as is practicable, these five areas are mutually exclusive – ie, a particular activity or performance measure will feature in only one domain. Inevitably overlaps and linkages exist and we will gradually refine how to manage these. In each domain a professional judgement will be applied to the range of quantitative and qualitative information available to arrive at a domain grade or score. The scoring system is a four-band approach, consistent with that used across the public sector and applying a judgement that performance is Excellent, Good, Fair or Poor.

---

<sup>4</sup> APACS is being retained as a performance indicator set, now renamed the Analysis of Policing and Community Safety.



### ***The five domains of rounded assessment***

20. The Confidence and Satisfaction domain consists of survey results from the British Crime Survey and, where they can be shown to be methodologically robust<sup>5</sup>, locally conducted surveys. The other four domains bring together quantitative performance measures, used routinely by forces themselves and collected by the Home Office, and more qualitative assessments that are based primarily upon inspection (fieldwork visits) evidence. This evidence includes interviews with senior officers, line managers and front-line staff; file and other documentary analysis; dip-sampling of records; remote analysis such as website visits; and a range of reality checks such as unannounced visits. HMIC is working closely with ACPO leads to identify, for each principal area of activity, what are the 'acid tests' of effective performance to ensure that fieldwork validation is targeted and proportionate.

21. As noted earlier, some domains are more amenable than others to desk-top review because the figures themselves tell a persuasive story. But where relevant we draw upon qualitative evidence to inform authoritative judgements. For each domain, the full set of quantitative measures and other evidence sources is set in Appendix C. Set out below are summaries of the domain description and contents, inviting feedback on the approach.

## **(A) CONFIDENCE AND SATISFACTION**

- **The Home Secretary has set for each force a stretching target to improve public confidence in each police force's ability to tackle the issues that matter to local people, work effectively with partners and treat people fairly and professionally. People need to feel confident that the police recognise issues of local concern and deal effectively with them, especially activities that some consider the lower end of seriousness – eg, anti-social behaviour – which are in fact matters of real and enduring concern to the public.**
- **Most citizens do understand that the police must also direct resources towards, for example, organised criminality and the threat of terrorism – all effort cannot be focused on local and low-level problems. The single confidence target is thus not distinct from achievement of other policing objectives, such as reducing crime, arresting offenders and investing resources in protecting communities from harm. If a force does well in both the everyday tasks and the more complex and serious aspects of policing - and lets its public know what it has achieved - then this should flow through into good/improving confidence levels of confidence and satisfaction.**

---

<sup>5</sup> We will seek advice from research and survey experts in the Home Office, NPIA and the police service on the key ways of validating force-based work.

- The Home Secretary's target is measured by a BCS question – are the police and local councils dealing with anti-social behaviour and crime issues that matter in their area? This links police efforts to those of their local government partners. To see the bigger picture and provide the best diagnosis of police performance, it may be helpful to set results from this measure alongside another BCS measure – the % of respondents saying they are confident/very confident in the local police. Further understanding could be gleaned from robust local surveys on confidence and satisfaction.

### **CONSULTATION QUESTION**

The Confidence and Satisfaction domain will reflect the Home Secretary's focus on confidence. How might the picture derived from the designated BCS measure be supplemented with the results of the BCS police-only confidence question and a force's own confidence data?

## **(B) LOCAL CRIME AND POLICING**

- Concerns about safety are central to community wellbeing, not simply the statistics about the actual incidence of crime and disorder but perceptions. Police performance in tackling local crime and policing – the everyday policing issues that are likely to affect many people - plays a major part in determining how safe people are and feel. The Local Crime and Policing domain includes those policing demands that are responded to primarily at basic command unit (BCU) or possibly neighbourhood level – violent crime such as robbery and assault; acquisitive crime, notably burglary and car theft; anti-social behaviour; and relevant detection and OBTJ rates.
- During 2009, HMIC is conducting inspections to assess how well forces are delivering the promises on police responsiveness contained in the Policing Pledge; if promises are not being honoured, what is the force doing to remedy this?
- Judgements in this domain will be driven by quantitative measures covering the incidence of crime, by type, and detection rates; levels of anti-social behaviour; and the measurable aspects of the Policing Pledge. (See Appendix C for full details of PIs.)

### **CONSULTATION QUESTION**

HMIC has identified a proposed set of performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Local Crime & Policing. Do you agree with this approach?

## **(C) PROTECTION FROM SERIOUS HARM**

- The bulk of policing activity happens at the local/neighbourhood level – responding to calls for assistance, tackling anti-social behaviour and investigating burglaries. Uniformed officers provide ‘front-line services’, supported by police staff in control rooms and elsewhere. But a small number of dangerous people present a serious threat to individuals and communities; these include terrorists, organised crime groups (trafficking and supplying Class A drugs, for example), armed criminals, wilfully dangerous drivers, violent people and sexual predators. Disrupting their activities requires more specialist policing skills, often deployed out of public view, and typically organised at force level or through co-operation between neighbouring forces.
- Although this area of policing is more complex and less immediately amenable to measurement than confidence/satisfaction and volume crime - some investigations may last months or even years and yet result in only a handful of convictions. But research shows that the impact on public confidence of ‘signal’ crimes such as murder cannot be over-estimated. In other instances, much effort goes into training officers to deal with an emergency such as major flooding or a chemical/biological attack, which are very serious but thankfully rare.
- The list of measures which will underpin the judgements for this domain (alongside professional assessment) include homicide rates, gun and knife crime, Class A drug supply and road deaths caused by dangerous driving.
- HMIC has conducted inspections (as part of its Protective Services programme) within the last two years in a number of areas relevant to this domain. These will be drawn upon and updated to provide the bases for judgements, underpinned by the quantitative data that is available. The key conclusions that we seek to draw are exemplified in the Appendix, and include:
  - *Does the force have sufficient, dedicated analytical capability to understand the threat posed by organised crime groups?*
  - *Is the force’s investigative capacity commensurate with workload?*
  - *How effective is the force in protecting vulnerable people and investigating rape?*

### **CONSULTATION QUESTION**

**HMIC has identified a proposed set of performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Protection from Serious Harm. Do you agree with this approach?**

## **(D) VALUE FOR MONEY**

- **Along with the rest of the public sector, police forces face the challenge of meeting rising demand for high quality services against a backdrop of very tight budgets. This places a premium on maximising productivity and securing the most efficient use of their resources.**
- **Value for money (VFM) is not simply a case of reducing unit costs or doing more for less. There is a moral obligation on the police service to do the best that it can with its £11 billion budget. Essentially, forces need a detailed understanding of the threat and harm posed by criminality in all its forms, so that they can then ensure that their resources are aligned and managed so as to counteract these threats. Officers need to be in the right place at the right time and doing the right things; managers and supervisors should know what results are being achieved; there must be a rational basis for the deployment of resources; and chief officers and the police authority should be able to account publicly for the relative costs of core policing activities, drawing upon benchmarking and VFM profiles.**
- **HMIC is developing a range of benchmarking profiles, showing whether each force is spending more or less than the average (and other benchmarks) on particular activities such as HR, crime investigation or response to calls for service. These profiles will not in themselves be definitive as a test of VFM but will point to where further investigation can identify opportunities for efficiency gains, and support local decision-making in this area. They also depend on good quality data being submitted by forces.**
- **Pending the establishment of these VFM profiles, interim assessments will take into account factors such as cost per head of population and cost per officer, evidence from external auditors and the Audit Commission's Use of Resources assessment as well as HMIC inspections. Police authorities now set local efficiency targets for forces (formerly this was a role for the Home Office) and the rigour of the approach will be tested during police authority inspections, commencing in July 2009; the results will inform RA.**

### **CONSULTATION QUESTION**

**HMIC has identified a proposed set of (interim) performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Value for Money. Do you agree with this approach?**

## **(E) MANAGING THE ORGANISATION**

- Policing is a major public service, delivered by over 233,000<sup>1</sup> people at a cost of some £11 billion this year. Details of forces' internal management arrangements are of minimal interest to the public but certain expectations must be met. Primarily, people expect high standards of leadership, professionalism and integrity; staff should be appropriately trained/qualified to perform their roles; as far as is practicable, the composition of the workforce should reflect the communities that the force serves (in terms of gender and ethnicity particularly) and services should be accessible to all sections of the community, including people with disabilities; performance outcomes should be monitored robustly, with weaknesses addressed promptly and effectively.
- Some quantitative data is available to support the judgements in this domain, notably on recruitment of female and minority ethnic officers and sickness absence, although care is often needed in interpreting this last data set. Information on training and accreditation will become increasingly available from the National Policing Improvement Agency. The proposed data set is shown in Appendix C.

### ***CONSULTATION QUESTION***

**HMIC has identified a proposed set of performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Managing the Organisation. Do you agree with this approach?**

## Rounded Assessment as a Police Performance Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism

---

### **4. METHODOLOGY – SCORING, QUALITY ASSURANCE AND REPORTING**

22. HMIC is committed to making its assessments clear and accessible, explaining to citizens whether or not their local police force is meeting required standards, improving performance over previous years and differentiating its results from those of its neighbours. Over the last ten years we have adopted several different approaches to suit the prevailing circumstances but believe that, for the purposes of RA, a four-band scoring system is suitable. This maintains consistency with other public sector inspectorates such as Ofsted (education) and the Audit Commission (local government), and thus allows a degree of 'read across' between the standards achieved by different services. In addition, our own experience is that a four-band system produces more differentiation; where only three grades are used there is a tendency to 'bunch' grades in the middle band.

23. HMIC currently proposes to use the descriptors Excellent, Good, Fair and Poor. Alternatives include the wording adopted for CAA - Performing Excellently/ Well/ Adequately or Poorly; traffic lights; or 'star ratings'. We have commissioned Ipsos/MORI to conduct research with members of the public to inform our final decision on a scoring system and descriptors, to ensure that we convey important messages about police performance in a language that citizens understand and can act upon as appropriate.

24. The most critical grading - *Poor* - will be used in situations where the force is not meeting the required national standards or is patently not delivering an acceptable level or quality of service. This could be a professional judgement based upon a failure to offer adequate protection from harm, especially to the most vulnerable members of society such as children. It should always be, unequivocally, a critical judgement requiring remedial action by the force. An *Excellent* grade will be awarded very sparingly, to commend exemplary service provision which consistently exceeds national threshold standards or normal expectations, and thus represents a 'beacon' for other forces.

25. The proposed *Good* grade indicates that the force (within its own context in terms of risks faced, stated priorities and available resources) is meeting - and in some instances exceeding - the relevant national standards and/or delivering services of a reasonable quality. This means that, generally speaking, smaller forces can achieve this grade, while taking proper account of the additional risks faced by large metropolitan forces. The *Fair* grade is the most difficult to describe and calibrate. HMIC is prepared to step outside the approach adopted by some other inspectorates, arguing that *Fair* does not mean acceptable/adequate/meets required standards. Instead, it is a grade which reflects a realistic view that the force concerned is doing reasonably well in some elements but generates concern in other areas, where service

quality or risk management is inadequate. **As with an outright *Poor* grade, a *Fair* judgement means that some remedial action is essential.**

26. HMIC proposes to grade each of the five domains using the four-band scoring system described above. We do not, however, propose to aggregate the five domain scores into an overarching score, as this treats unlike domain contents as homogenous, and masks the need to respond promptly to *Poor* and *Fair* grades.

### **CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

**Do you agree with the general approach adopted for scoring, including the proposed four-band system and the descriptor for a *Fair* grade? If not, what alternative scoring approach do you propose? Do you agree that domain grades should not be aggregated?**

### **Developing a narrative**

27. One of HMIC's key aims is to engage the public in police issues and provide them with a local picture of police performance in their area. An overall grade for each domain is part of this but police performance can rarely be summarised in just one word. The individual force reports will spell out what the force is doing well and where it needs to improve, and indicate HMIC's views about the future prospects.

### **Use of data**

28. Clearly, objective comparative data is extremely useful as a diagnostic tool to focus questions. In some domains such as Local Crime and Policing, where there is a rich seam of data to mine, the final grade would almost certainly have a close correlation with data. But HMIC's approach will not be prescriptive or arithmetic – we propose to link data outcomes with qualitative assessment to arrive at the final grade.

29. In conjunction with technical practitioners in forums, and consulting with ACPO leads and others, HMIC will apply a methodology to 'weight' quantitative and qualitative information to arrive at domain scores. The primary consideration, bearing in mind the 'localism' agenda and what is of interest to the public, is ***how well each force is performing against its own targets and recent history.***

### **Quality assurance**

30. HMIs will ensure quality assurance throughout the development of the methodology, the weighting of data and qualitative assessment to generate scores and the drafting of narratives. An internal panel will be established to ensure consistency and robustness in the judgement process. The overall approach will be supported by an external steering group drawn from similar membership as the PPSG Steering Group. We acknowledge ongoing concerns with the quality/reliability of the data that necessarily underpin some of the performance judgements. HMIC is currently engaged in work to probe



and validate data on most serious violence offences, for example, and we remain on constant alert to the issue of data quality.

## **Reporting**

31. We propose a tiered approach to the presentation of information. The headline tier (equivalent to the front page of a newspaper) will comprise the main messages for public consumption, setting out the overall domain judgement and accompanying narrative (see appendix D1). Statistics will be used sparingly, as research shows that the public is neither interested in, nor trusting of, statistics. The second tier (see appendix D2). will present a more detailed account of the evidence underpinning the overall judgment, including relevant data sets. The principal audiences for this second tier are those with a monitoring/scrutiny role (eg, chief and senior police officers, police authority members and officers and Government officials), although some journalists, researchers and academics may also find this level of detail useful. Finally, the base of the pyramid is a wealth of data and qualitative assessment that will form management information for practitioners.

32. Although HMIC has had a website in place for some years, this has been a passive repository of information such as published reports. For RA, the intention is to use a dynamic website, regularly updated, to offer a 'snapshot in time' of current performance at initially force and then more local level. It will have links to other sites so that, for example, people can access their local force's crime mapping website having looked at HMIC's judgements. Technical and procurement complexities have delayed the establishment of this website but we hope to have it in place by May 2009, starting simply and growing in sophistication and detail.

33. Autumn 2009 will see the first published, force-by-force judgements but it is not HMIC's intention to present an annual 'set piece' tabulated assessment. Instead, we will expect police authorities and forces to use RA to help in fulfilling their statutory role of keeping their local public informed of performance. RA will feed the monitoring process (exemplified by PPSG); form the basis of HMCIC's annual report on the state of policing; and assist Regional HMIs to work with forces on performance improvement. RA will also, as noted earlier, inform CAA judgements.

### ***CONSULTATION QUESTION***

**Does the proposal for a web-based, regularly updated assessment of police performance on a force-by-force basis meet your expectations of how HMIC should discharge its monitoring role? If not, what alternative options do you wish to propose?**



## **Rounded Assessment as a Police Performance Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism**

---

### **5. NEXT STEPS: RESPONDING TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

This section sets out the timeline for the development of Rounded Assessment and how we will act on the responses received to this consultation. Information provided in response to this consultation may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes - primarily, the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

#### **Submitting your responses**

Please send your response, using the attached response template, to HMIC by **Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009**.

#### ***Police Authority responses***

In line with an agreement reached with the APA, police authorities are asked to respond via the Association of Police Authorities, submitting responses to [ritchie.forbes@lga.gov.uk](mailto:ritchie.forbes@lga.gov.uk)

#### ***Police force responses***

In line with an agreement reached with ACPO, police forces are asked to respond via Chief Constable Roger Baker (Chair, ACPO Performance Management Business Area) submitting responses to [sean.ocallaghan@essex.pnn.police.uk](mailto:sean.ocallaghan@essex.pnn.police.uk)

#### **Alternatively, please send your response by:**

E-mail: [raresponse@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:raresponse@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk)

Mail: David Harris, HMIC, Ashley House, 2 Monck Street, London, SW1P 2BQ

#### **Next Steps**

HMIC is committed to developing a rounded assessment that meets the needs of its users, and in particular the public. This consultation exercise is a vital part of achieving those aims. We are committed to listening to, and acting upon, what you tell us. Once the consultation process is completed we will publish a document setting out:

1. What you told us;
2. How we are going to take these views into account; and
3. How we aim to continue a dialogue with you.

**CONSULTATION QUESTIONS**

- 1. The Confidence and Satisfaction domain will reflect the Home Secretary's focus on confidence. How might the picture derived from the designated BCS measure be reconciled with the results of the BCS police-only confidence question and a force's own confidence data?**
- 2. HMIC has identified a proposed set of performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Local Crime & Policing. Do you agree with this approach?**
- 3. HMIC has identified a proposed set of performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Protection from Serious Harm. Do you agree with this approach?**
- 4. HMIC has identified a proposed set of (interim) performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Value for Money. Do you agree with this approach?**
- 5. HMIC has identified a proposed set of performance measures and key conclusions that will lead to the overall domain score for Managing the Organisation. Do you agree with this approach?**
- 6. Do you agree with the general approach adopted for scoring, including the proposed four-band system and the descriptor for a *Fair* grade? If not, what alternative scoring approach do you propose? Do you agree that domain grades should not be aggregated?**
- 7. Does the proposal for a web-based, regularly updated assessment of police performance on a force-by-force basis meet your expectations of how HMIC should discharge its monitoring role? If not, what alternative options do you wish to propose?**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **CONSULTEES**

This consultation document will be available publicly on the HMIC website; in addition HMIC has commissioned a set of public focus groups. The views of other interested groups and members of the public are vital to ensuring the final model meets the needs of the public.

The development of HMIC's performance monitoring has benefited greatly from discussion with, and input from, a wide-ranging group of key stakeholders. Building on the current and continuing input of the PPSG/RA Steering Group, the consultation aims to secure a wider and more comprehensive view from delivery partners, and is targeted primarily at:

#### **Police Service**

*(via Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), Superintendents Association and Police Federation)*

#### **Police Authorities**

*(via Association of Police Authorities (APA))*

#### **The Home Office and other government departments**

Other consultees include the Local Government Association, the Audit Commission, the National Policing Improvement Agency, the Welsh Assembly Government, regional Government Offices, the Human Rights and Equalities Commission and relevant policy 'think tanks' and academic bodies.

**APPENDIX B****Diagnostic performance indicator set, 2009/10****APACS INDICATOR SUMMARY TABLE**

APACS number	NI number	PSA	Short title
1.1		24	Satisfaction with service delivery (Police)
1.2			Comparative satisfaction with service delivery (Police)
1.3			Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents)
1.4		24	Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS)
2.1	27		Understanding local concerns (agencies)
2.2	21	23	Dealing with local concerns (agencies)
2.3			Residents perception of police performance
2.4		24	Confidence in effectiveness of the CJS
2.5		24	Confidence in fairness of the CJS
3.1			Minority ethnic police officer recruitment
3.2			Female police officer representation
4.1	17	23	Perception of anti-social behaviour
4.2	41	25	Perception of drunk or rowdy behaviour
4.3	42	25	Perception of drug use/drug dealing
5.1	15	23	Serious violent crime rate
5.2	16	23	Serious acquisitive crime rate
5.3	20		Assaults with less serious injury rate
5.4	34		Domestic homicide rate
5.5	29		Gun crime rate
5.6	28		Knife crime rate
6.1		24	Serious violent offences brought to justice
6.2		24	Serious acquisitive offences brought to justice
6.3			Sanction detection rate for racially and religiously aggravated crimes
6.4		24	Serious sexual offences brought to justice
7.1	33		Deliberate fires
8.1		24	Asset recovery
9.1	47		Road traffic casualties
10.1	30		Prolific and other Priority Offender re-offending rate
11.1	18	23	Adult re-offending rate
11.2	19	23	Youth re-offending rate
11.3	111	14	First time youth offending
11.4*	38	25	Drug-related (class A) offending
12.1			Police service efficiency
13.1			Police officer sickness absence rate
13.2			Police staff sickness absence rate
14.1*	32		Repeat incidents of domestic violence

\* New for 2009/10

## APPENDIX C

### Quantitative measures and qualitative assessments for each domain

#### (A) Confidence and Satisfaction

##### Quantitative data

- Key data sources are the British Crime Survey, other indicators from APACS and locally collected survey results.
- Confidence of respondents that the Police are dealing with local concerns about crime and ASB.
- Understanding of local concerns about ASB and crime by the local council and police [NI (27), APACS 2.1]
- Dealing with local concerns about crime and ASB by police and local councils [NI (21), APACS 2.2]
- Perceptions of anti-social behaviour, drunk/rowdy behaviour and drug-dealing [NI (17), APACS 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3]
- Confidence in police - % of respondents saying they are confident/very confident in their local police [APACS 2.3]
- Force-level survey data on confidence - where available and validated as methodologically robust
- Satisfaction:
  - Satisfaction with service delivery (Police) - [APACS 1.1] (including breakdown of KDIs; ease of contact, satisfaction with arrival time, actions taken, follow-up, and treatment)
  - Comparative satisfaction with service delivery (Police) [APACS 1.2]
  - Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents) - [APACS 1.3]

##### Key conclusions (and sources)

- ✚ What progress is the force making towards its single confidence target?
- ✚ How confident are local people in the force?
- ✚ How satisfied are users with the quality of services provided by the force?
- ✚ Are satisfaction gaps between white and BME users closing?

## (B) Local Crime and Policing

### Quantitative data

All crimes per 1,000 population

Serious violent crime rate [APACS 5.1]

Serious acquisitive crime rate [APACS 5.2]

Deliberate fires (arson) [APACS 7.1]

Prolific and other priority offender re-offending rate [APACS 10.1]

Repeat incidents of domestic violence [APACS 14.1]

Offences brought to justice:	serious violent crime [APACS 6.1]
	serious acquisitive crime [APACS 6.2]
	racially aggravated crime [APACS 6.3]

### Key conclusions (and sources)

- ✚ How well is the force performing on volume crime reduction and detection? (quantitative data above)
- ✚ How effective is the force in partnership work, including local authorities and other criminal justice agencies? (quantitative data above, CAA grades, CoMPASS)
- ✚ Is Neighbourhood Policing embedded, exemplified by the delivery of Policing Pledge promises? (HMIC inspection of Policing Pledge in 2009; inspection of NHP in 2008)
- ✚ Is a citizen focus evident in service provision? (HMIC inspection of Citizen Focus in 2008; contact management data; complaints data, especially incivilities)
- ✚ How effective is the force's management of critical incidents? (HMIC inspection of first-line supervision, HMIC inspection of Critical Incident management in 22 forces, 2008/09)

### Areas for development

- Effectiveness in managing intelligence (fieldwork)
- Effective use of forensic management (quantitative data)

## (C) PROTECTION FROM SERIOUS HARM

### Quantitative data (all currently collected)

- Recorded homicide rate
- Domestic homicide rate [APACS 5.4]
- Serious knife crime and gun crime rates [APACS 5.5, 5.6]
- Drug-related (Class A) offending rate and drug trafficking [APACS 11.4]
- OBTJ rates for the above
- Serious sexual offences brought to justice [APACS 6.4]
- People/children killed/seriously injured in road traffic collisions [APACS 9.1]
- Asset recovery measures [APACS 8.1]
- Volume and value of controlled drugs seized
- Volume of firearms/knives seized
- Contextual measure: specialist support available to victims of serious sexual offences (eg, SARCs) and trained specialist investigators (will require some fieldwork)
- Diagnostic measure: basket of indicators relating to rape investigation (Home Office and HMIC monitoring, HMIC fieldwork)

### Key conclusions (and sources)

- ✚ Does the force have sufficient, dedicated analytical capability to understand the range of harm, and map the threats, posed by organised crime groups? (Serious & Organised Crime inspection, 2008; quantitative data)
- ✚ Is the force's investigative capacity commensurate with workload and can it deploy appropriate specialist techniques in order to bring offenders to justice? (Major Crime investigation inspection, 2008; quantitative data)
- ✚ How well is the force protecting vulnerable people? (HMIC/other inspections)
- ✚ Is the force able to achieve its targets under the Proceeds of Crime Act? (quantitative data)
- ✚ Can the force call upon adequate capacity and capability to meet national and regional demands for public order and CBRN support? (HMIC inspection of 22 forces, 2008; PNICC national mobilisation plan; Cabinet Office)

 **Areas for development**

- How comprehensive and effective is the force's risk assessment regime, as evidenced by the quality of its Strategic Assessment and control strategies?
- How effective is the force's efforts to work collaboratively and close the Protective Services gap?

## (D) VALUE FOR MONEY & PRODUCTIVITY

### **Quantitative data**






**Pending the development of benchmarking profiles, due to come onstream from Autumn 2009, HMIC proposes to use existing data sets as the primary quantitative source of information to inform its judgments.**

- HMIC analysis of the 2009-10 CIPFA Estimates, by MSF group; comparative data identifies higher/lower costs than peer average. Analysis will focus on key cost indicators such as:
  - Gross revenue expenditure costs per 1,000 population
  - Gross revenue costs per full time equivalent police officer
  - Precept levels

### **Other sources of evidence**

- PFI costs account for significant differences between forces; data relating to PFI schemes (provided by the Home Office) on the number of schemes in each force, along with their purpose and value, will be used to help explain any significant variances from MSF or national averages.
- The achievement of Efficiency Plan targets for the last 3 to 5 financial years.
- Results of the Audit Commission's Police Use of Resources (PURE) assessment for 2008-09; these evaluate value for money arrangements across three themes - Managing Finances, Governing the Business and Managing Resources. Scores of 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent) are awarded.

### **Key conclusions (and sources)**

-  How does the cost of policing per head of population and per officer compare with national and peer averages? (HMIC analysis)
-  Is there evidence of robust processes to match supply to demand? (PURE)
-  Have stretching local targets been set and achieved for efficiency?
-  Is there evidence that staffing profiles/benchmarking point to relatively high costs? If yes, how is the force responding? (HMIC analysis, and later fieldwork)
-  How effective is cost recovery and income generation? (HMIC analysis)



**Areas for development**

- VFM profiling (from Autumn 2009) and VFM inspections
- Has the force (and police authority) undertaken a comprehensive assessment of risks and threats and sought to marshal resources appropriately?
- Are managers held to account as rigorously for use of resources as they are for performance outcomes?
- Is there evidence that the force is maximising the advantages of shared services and regional/national procurement arrangements?

**(E) MANAGING THE ORGANISATION**

**Quantitative data**

- **ADR 552: Attendance management**
- **ADR 571: Staff numbers by location**
- **SPI 3e: Minority Ethnic staff and officers representation**  
Number of FTE officers, by ethnicity (White, Mixed Ethnicity, Asian or Asian-British, Black or Black British, Chinese, Other or not stated); by force)
- **Turnover rates for police officers and police staff, by rank and grades**

**Key conclusions (and sources)**

- 🚩 Can the force demonstrate that it has invested appropriately in arrangements to promote high professional standards and counter the risk of corruption? (IPCC reports and complaints data; Serious and Organised Crime inspection 2008; Pledge inspection 2009.)
- 🚩 Is there evidence of sound HR planning, with a commitment to an appropriately skilled, accredited workforce? (NPIA, Major Crime inspection 2008, Phase 3 inspection 2009)
- 🚩 Is sickness absence and staff turnover managed effectively? (ADR data)
- 🚩 Is the force fully compliant with statutory equalities requirements, and is it proactive in its commitment to diversity – notably, in meeting its own commitments to a representative workforce? (Quantitative data, Pledge inspection)
- 🚩 Is there evidence of accessibility in service provision, especially to people with disabilities? (Quantitative data)
- 🚩 Are performance management arrangements driven by chief officers and effective in holding BCUs, departments and individuals to account and tackling under-performance? (HMIC inspection, data quality audits, HO information on ADR returns, fieldwork evidence)

## Rounded Assessment Consultation

✚ How robust is information security and management? (MOPI compliance)

### **Areas for development**

- Workforce reform (HMIC inspection in 2010)
- Leadership development

APPENDIX D1

The screenshot shows the HMIC website interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with links: Home, About Us, How well are your Local Police Performing?, Inspections, Job Vacancies, Press Releases, and Contact Us. A search bar is located on the right side. The main content area is titled 'Borssetshire' and features a large image of a police officer. Below the image, there is a section titled 'How well is Borssetshire Performing?' which lists five key areas of performance with their respective ratings and 'Read more...' links:

- Confidence & Satisfaction:** Good (two green checkmarks). Rating: Good.
- Local crime and Policing:** Fair (one green checkmark and one yellow checkmark). Rating: Fair.
- Value for money:** Excellent (three green checkmarks). Rating: Excellent.
- Managing the service:** Poor (one red X). Rating: Poor.
- Protection from serious harm and organised crime:** Good (two green checkmarks). Rating: Good.

Below these sections, there is a 'Policing Pledge' section with a PDF link: 'Policing Pledge – Borssetshire – Jul 2009 (40kb PDF)'. At the bottom, there is a section for 'Other recent inspection reports for Borssetshire' with three PDF links and their dates: 'Performance Review Inspection (40kb PDF) - May 2008', 'Performance Review Inspection (46kb PDF) - June 2007', and 'Performance Review Inspection (33kb PDF) - Jan 2007'. The footer contains the text: 'Have your say | Freedom of information | Terms and conditions | Cymraeg'.

## APPENDIX D2

The screenshot shows a web browser window displaying the HMIC website. The browser's address bar shows the URL: <http://www.hmic.org.uk/Borsetshire/ConfidenceAndSatisfaction/>. The page title is "HMIC Inspection Methodologies | Home Office - HMI Constabulary".

The website header includes the HMIC logo with the tagline "Inspecting policing in the public interest". A search bar is located in the top right corner, with a "GO" button. Below the search bar are links for "A-Z index", "Glossary", "Accessibility", and "Useful links".

The main navigation menu includes: Home, About Us, How well are your Local Police Performing?, Inspections, Job Vacancies, Press Releases, and Contact Us. The "How well are your Local Police Performing?" menu item is currently selected.

The page content is titled "Confidence & Satisfaction" and is part of a series of pages for Borsetshire Police. The breadcrumb trail is: Home > How well is Borsetshire Police performing? > Confidence & Satisfaction. A navigation sidebar on the left lists: How well is Borsetshire Police Performing?, Confidence & Satisfaction (selected), Local crime and Policing, Value for money, Managing the service, and Protections from serious harm and organised crime.

The main content area features a photograph of a police officer with a dog. Below the photo is the section header "Confidence & Satisfaction" and the sub-header "How is Borsetshire performing in this area?". The text states: "The high levels of victim satisfaction during 2006/07 have been sustained. Protective services have seen increased investment. Lancashire has achieved reductions in both acquisitive and violent crime: the levels of domestic burglary and vehicle crime are now the lowest in 35 and 28 years respectively. Also, the high sanction detection rates and the percentage of offences brought to justice achieved during 2006/07 have been sustained and improved upon, (9% reduction in recorded crime for 2007/8 and 19% over the last three years). Staff now have access to 3,000 personal data assistants and 400 mobile data terminals, allowing access to e-forms and systems anytime, anywhere, allowing more time out on patrol. The constabulary has also engaged Operation Quest, delivering sustained benefits in officer time savings, increased performance and improved customer satisfaction force-wide."

Below the text, there is a link to a PDF document: [Detailed assessment - Borsetshire - Nov 2008 \(250kb PDF\)](#).

On the right side of the page, there are two utility boxes. The first is "Find your local Police Force" with a search button and a dropdown menu for "Already know your Force?". The second is "History" with a list of dates: January 2009, October 2008, July 2008, and April 2008.

The footer of the page contains the text: "Have your say | Freedom of information | Terms and conditions | Cymraeg".